

## REMARKS

The present application was filed on January 15, 2002 with claims 1 through 6. Claims 1-6 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application. Claims 1 and 4 are proposed to be amended and claims 2 and 5 are proposed to be cancelled, without prejudice,  
5 herein

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Huttunen (United States Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0010896) and further in view of Hosur et al. (United States Patent Number 6,977,910), and rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Critchlow (United States  
10 Patent Number 5,276,706) and further in view of Yoshie et al (United States Patent Number 6,731,698), and Bar-David et al. (United States Patent Number 5,623,511). The Examiner indicated that claims 2-3 and 5-6 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

### Independent Claims 1 and 4

15 Independent claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Huttunen and further in view of Hosur et al. Independent claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Critchlow and further in view of Yoshie et al., and Bar-David et al. Regarding claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Huttunen discloses generating a set of reference symbols on the basis of a predetermined set (i.e., training signal FIG. 2;  
20 paragraph 23). Regarding claim 4, the Examiner asserts that Critchlow discloses that the filter signal is compared with the predetermined set of symbols (means 36) in order to detect a symbol with the highest reliability (FIG. 1, means 44).

Applicants note that the Examiner indicated that claims 2 and 5 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and  
25 any intervening claims. Independent claims 1 and 4 have been amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 2 and 5, respectively.

Thus, Huttunen and Hosur et al., alone or in any combination, do not disclose or suggest generating a correction signal on the basis of the detected symbol convolved with the channel impulse response, wherein the correction signal is subtracted from the part of the  
30 received signal which succeeds the part of the received signal corresponding to the detected

symbol for suppressing the ISI-effect, as required by independent claim 1, as amended, and Critchlow, Yoshie et al., and Bai-David et al., alone or in any combination, do not disclose or suggest generating a correction signal on the basis of the detected symbol, wherein the correction signal is subtracted from the part of filter signal which succeeds the part of the filter signal corresponding to the detected symbol for suppressing the ISI-effect, as required by independent claim 4, as amended.

Dependent Claims 2-3 and 5-6

The Examiner has already indicated that claims 2-3 and 5-6 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

All of the pending claims following entry of the amendments, i.e., claims 1, 3, 4, and 6, are in condition for allowance and such favorable action is earnestly solicited

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin M. Mason  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 36,597  
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP  
1300 Post Road, Suite 205  
Fairfield, CT 06824  
(203) 255-6560

Date: June 22, 2007

20

25